

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/662,112	09/12/2003	Russell S. Long	02-2361	9095	
8840	7590 02/01/2005		EXAMINER		
	EAMANS CHERIN &	PATEL, KIRAN B			
	CHNICAL CENTER ICAL DRIVE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ALCOA CENTER, PA 15069-0001			3612		
			DATE MAIL ED. 02/01/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					11			
		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~			
			12	LONG ET AL.	(			
Office Action Summary		Examine	7	Art Unit				
		Kiran B. F	Patel	3612				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears on th	e cover sheet with the	correspondence address	;			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3) period for reply is specified above, the maximum so ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION.  c of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no expending the second in the standard of the second in the seco	ent, however, may a reply be ti tutory minimum of thirty (30) da rill expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror blication to become ABANDON	imely filed  ys will be considered timely.  In the mailing date of this communi  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ication.			
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>07 January 200</i>	<b>95</b> .					
,	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.							
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9-13 and</u> Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-8,14,26</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restri	<u>15-25</u> is/are withdraw						
Applicat	ion Papers							
10)	The specification is objected to by the three drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	: a) ☐ accepted or b ection to the drawing(s) g the correction is requi	be held in abeyance. So red if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.1				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected t	o by the Examiner. N	ote the attached Offic	e Action or form PTO-15	52.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•					
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority  2. Certified copies of the priority  3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation	documents have been documents have been of the priority documents Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Applica ents have been receiv le 17.2(a)).	ition No ved in this National Stag	е			
2) Notic	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o				)			
3) Infor					1			

Final Rejection

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-8, 14, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pringnitz (6,796,603) in view of Hanni et al. (5,287,813) and Taul (4,136,985).

Regarding claims 1-8, 14, 26 Pringnitz (6,796,603) discloses the invention as claimed to include a frame assembly 14 comprising a top rail, a bottom rail, and a pair of side rails connecting the top and bottom rails, the frame assembly defining a rectangular shape and having an exposed side facing outward from the trailer body when the rear case assembly is attached to the trailer body and an internal side configured to be attached to the trailer body 10; a light guard assembly (Fig 1) attached to the bottom rail on the exposed side of the frame assembly 14, the

Application/Control Number: 10/662,112 Page 3

Art Unit: 3612

light guard assembly comprising a pair of light guard members and a bumper member (Fig 1) connecting the light guard members, the light guard members each defining at least one light-receiving socket; a pair of stiffener members attached (Fig 1) to the side rails, respectively, on the exposed side of the frame assembly for increasing the strength of the side rails.

However, Pringnitz (6,796,603) does not disclose extruded aluminum rails and a pair of reinforcing plates.

Hanni et al. (5,287,813) discloses in Fig 1-3 extruded aluminum rails.

Taul (4,136,985) discloses in Fig 1 a pair of reinforcing plates.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention, as disclosed by Pringnitz (6,796,603), to include extruded aluminum rails, as disclosed by Hanni et al. (5,287,813) and a pair of reinforcing plates, as disclosed by Taul (4,136,985), to optimize the weight and the strength of the frame for better fuel efficiency.

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/7/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 3612

Applicant argued that Pringnitz (6,796,603) patent is directly solely towards latches for roll up type truck cargo doors is not accurate because along with the latches it also discloses and teaches the limitations used for the rejection. One having ordinary skill in the art would utilize aluminum rails, reinforcing plates, and welded joints as indicated at col 6, lines 20-25, "Reasonable variation and modification are possible and within the scope of the forgoing description and the drawings without departing from the spirit of the invention."

## Conclusion

2. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

Application/Control Number: 10/662,112 Page 5

Art Unit: 3612

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Primary Examiner Kiran B. Patel whose telephone number is 703-305-0254. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00 to 5:00. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Kiran B. Patel, P.E. Primary Examiner Art Unit 3612 January 27, 2005